Fredric Jameson – A Greimas Square on Gramsci, Althusser and Antinomies in their union (1999)

I. Gramsci and proletarian forms, culture and integral state – how there is a unique part and whole in Gramsci distinct from Althusser’s structured and mechanical whole

The Greimas square opposes Gramsci and Althusser in an antinomy that Gramsci is more of an organic intellectual and Althusser a theoreticist – which means that organically the cultural formalisms, even religious folk forms, and even types of language, and critical styles of intellectual culture all get mediated by the

integral state-civil society and form even around individuals who are popular as Jewish people and Hebrewaisne.

II. Jameson therefore on Culture

And so culture is in fact a unity of gestus and structures in Gramsci – something also like a unity of spiritual wholes in Bibles, Quran and

Torahs to the concrete whole in Sartre’ developing praxis sense of a totality, and even unlike the mechanical Althusser or even atomism of Stieglitz and economics in Varoufakis – which just debates financial transactions which is a planar space of a type called empty formalism by Varoufakis – like a line going to a Madrid city without its cultural forms.

III. Culture in Madrid and its gestus

And so in fact Gramsci criticizes Madrid for not having forms of proletarian parties, forms of councils and shops or even forms of cinema culture – or even finally religious formalisms of Ortega y Gasset – which is simple Church, Institution and university culture –

which then would imbibe all the financial money being spent into a rich culture – now we articulate contraries –

Spanish Althusser then as a bit of a gestus which then is contrary to Gramsci who is a praxis oriented whole which has the antinomy pronounced as in fact the process of companies in Spain and Madrid being in fact

complex assemblages which though do not unfold in public spheres as Moishe Postone argues because it has no developmental unity like Israel and Tel Aviv – a developing praxis whole as it were which is missing in Postone – that capital just develops as a Subject-Object without Jewish overall development that Sirohi criticizes it for – which is better in

the French simple Quran and better than Hebrew simple finance talking because it is an organic concrete and abstract unity called in Judaism – Marxism.

Developmental unity means that it is like a developing syllogism, of unities which are concrete and praxis-like – or practice like in the concrete Sartrean whole sense – which

becomes small businesses and cheap ideas of colleges because thatis the developing Individual of the Jewish formation – the militant and Christian person from whom in fact the developments becomes Kierkegaardian – and this is called Jewish overall development – against Postone’s love for empty jargon.